

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESPONSE TO NOTICE TO ADVISE OF SCHEDULING CONFLICTS

Case Number: 2024-1098Short Case Caption: Brita LP v. ITCParty Name(s): Zero Technologies, LLC and Culligan International Co.

INFORMATION: The court uses this form to determine whether and when to schedule cases for oral argument. Arguing counsel may be changed later, but a motion to reschedule is required once the court schedules argument. Please plan in advance to adhere to the limit on the number of arguing counsel in Fed. Cir. R. 34(e).

Argument Waiver ☐ My party intends to waive oral argument.

NOTE: Filers checking this box must still complete the below sections. **The court may still schedule this case for oral argument even if any party intends to waive argument.** If scheduled, parties may still elect to waive argument using the response to notice of oral argument form.

Other Parties Representing Interests

☐ Counsel for another party will represent my party's interests at oral argument

NOTE: If this box is checked, skip the remaining sections. Any argument date will be selected based on conflict dates for counsel arguing on behalf of your party.

Name of Expected Arguing Counsel	John Letchinger
---	-----------------

Dates Unavailable

Do you have dates of unavailability within the specific sessions identified by the court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts in your case?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing **up to ten dates** of unavailability and **include a statement showing good cause for each date.** Dates without good cause or that do not pertain to arguing counsel (e.g., client conflicts) will not be accepted. The court will only accept dates for one counsel and only if that counsel has filed an entry of appearance. The Clerk's Office will evaluate and note accepted or rejected conflict dates; counsel may contact the Clerk's Office about re-filing if dates are rejected. *See* Fed. Cir. R. 34(d); Practice Notes to Rule 34.

FORM 32. Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts

Form 32
March 2023

Potential Case Conflicts

Are there other pending cases before this court (regardless of case status) in which expected arguing counsel in this case also expects to argue?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, attach a separate sheet listing those cases.

I certify the above information and any attached statement is complete and accurate. I further certify that I will update my notice should new conflicts arise or existing conflicts change.

Date: 08/20/2024

Signature: /s/ John Letchinger

Name: John Letchinger

BakerHostetler

Baker&Hostetler LLP

One North Wacker Drive
Suite 3700
Chicago, IL 60606-2859

T 312.416.6200
F 312.416.6201
www.bakerlaw.com

John Letchinger
direct dial: 312.416.6206
jletchinger@bakerlaw.com

August 20, 2024

VIA ECF

Jarrett B. Perlow
Circuit Executive & Clerk of Court
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal
Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W.
Washington, DC 20439

**Re: Response to Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts, *Brita LP v. ITC*,
No. 24-1098**

Dear Mr. Perlow:

I am principal counsel to Intervenor Zero Technologies, LLC and Culligan International Co. in this appeal. I submit this statement in response to the Court's Notice to Advise of Scheduling Conflicts (ECF No. 51) and pursuant to Federal Circuit Rule 34(d)(3), which requires arguing counsel to describe the good cause for each identified scheduling conflict.

Jarrett B. Perlow
August 20, 2024
Page 2

Dates Unavailable	Reason
December 2-6, 2024	Scheduled participation in a trial the week immediately following the oral argument session, and scheduled travel to the trial location. <i>See Brinker Int'l, Inc. et al. v. US Foods, Inc. and Services Group of America, Inc.</i> , Dist. Court of Dallas Cnty., TX, 160th Judicial Dist., Case. No. DC-00224.
January 6-10, 2025	Pre-planned vacation and family engagement.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John Letchinger

John Letchinger
Partner